UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,785	07/10/2003	Lawrence Wasicek	1001.1693101	2009
	7590 07/09/201 SEAGER & TUFTE, L	EXAMINER		
1221 NICOLLE SUITE 800		NGUYEN, VI X		
	S, MN 55403-2420	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3731	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/616,785	WASICEK, LAWRE	NCE	
Examiner	Art Unit		

	VICTOR X. NGUYEN	3731	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>16 June 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, v with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (l)</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailir	g date of the final rejection	on.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sist forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	). on which the petition under 37 CFR 1. ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply orig	136(a) and the appropriat of the fee. The appropring inally set in the final Office	e extension fee ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi <u>AMENDMENTS</u></li> </ol>	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NO v);	TE below);	
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a converse NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12			PTOL-324).
<ul> <li>5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> <li>6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ul>	·		·
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8,10-15,19-21,24-29,33,34,38-40 and Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	ided below or appended.	ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Gary Jackson/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, TC 3700 July 6, 2010	/VN/ Examiner Art Unit: 3731		

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments have not been found persuasive. Applicants state that Daniel does not appear to disclose a connector which connects a proximal section and a distal section of an elongate shaft and a filter coupled to the shaft. Examiner disagrees. In fact, as seen in fig. 4 of Daniel discloses a connector 132 connecting the proximal section 114 and the distal section 116 of the elongate shaft 112, wherein the connector 132 is fixedly secured to both the proximal section and the distal section (fig. 4), securing the distal end of the proximal section with the proximal end of the distal section. Daniel, fig. 4 is silent regarding a filter coupled to the shaft. However, Daniel teaches a filter 21 coupled to the shaft (fig. 9, element 112). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Daniel's fig. 4 with a filter coupled to the shaft as taught by Daniel in other embodiment (figure. 9) in order to filter plaque, thrombus which releases into the blood stream during invasive procedures that performed in blood vessels. The phrase "a filter coupled to the shaft" in the claim is broad enough to mean that "something that joints, or links, or engages two things together" as evidence by "Merriam-Webster on line dictionary. Thus, the filter 21, fig. 9 of Daniel appears to be coupled or engaged to the shaft 112. The same arguments will apply to Daniel in view of Steven (as the final office action, pages 2-7 as recited in claims 10, 24, 39-40, 44 mailed 4/27/2010). Accordingly, the above noted references are still considered to read on the claimed limitations of the claimed noted.